APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/459,493	12/13/1999	MOSHE RUBIN	6866-101C2	1209

7590   09/30/2003

Marc Sockol
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER
COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/459,493	RUBIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Carl Colin	2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _12/13/1999_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-80_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-80_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _13 December 1999_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _5,7,9-11_ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Pursuant to USC 131, claims 1-80 are presenting for examination.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains embedded hyperlinks and/or other form

of browser-executable codes (see p.1, line31; p.2, lines 3 and 31; and p.3, lines 6 and 24).

Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser-executable

codes. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and
> distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims **5, 18, 31, 40, 57, and 70** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

2.1   Regarding **claims 5, 18, 31, 40, 57, and 70,** the phrase "substantially similar" renders the

claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those

encompassed by " substantially similar "), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s)

unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another
filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an
international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1),
(2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for
patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002

do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA

35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3.1   **Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10-14, 17, 19-21, 23-27, 30, 32, 34-36, 39, 41, 43-53, 56, 58-60, 62-66,**

69, 71-75, 77-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent

5,881,287 to **Mast**.

3.2   **As per claim 1, Mast** substantially teaches a method for protecting digital images copied

from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-62). **Mast** discloses the

step of transmitting stored pixel data from a computer memory to a video RAM (column 3, lines

25-57). As defined in the dictionary, the pixels are the basic units of the composition of the

image disclosed by **Mast**. **Mast** also discloses the step of identifying protected image within the

image in memory that meets the recitation of identifying the protected pixel data within the

stored pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, lines 57-61). **Mast** further discloses

the steps of modifying the stored pixel data, thereby generating modified pixel data within which

individual pixel datum is recognizable as being protected or unprotected (column 3, lines 30-49

and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1); and in response to pixel data being copied

from the video RAM, replacing individual pixel datum copied from the video RAM, that is

protected, with substitute pixel datum (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and

column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1).

As per claims **4, 30, and 56, Mast** discloses the limitation of further comprising the step

of displaying the pixel data in the video RAM (column 9, lines 22-30).

As per claim **6, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the

video RAM by a screen capture command (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim **7, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the

video RAM by command to copy screen data to a clipboard (column 10, lines 52-66 and

columns 11-12).

As per claims **8, 32, and 60, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the protected pixel

data is pixel data for at least one protected digital image (see fig. 8 and column 10, line 52

through column 12).

3.3   **As per claims 12 and 34, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data

is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47).

3.4   **As per claims 13 and 35, Mast** discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted stored

pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

3.5   **As per claim 10, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is

encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47). **Mast** further discloses that the image files are

protected from misappropriation with some form of encryption and suggests to use other

encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7, lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent

to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme, to have the substitute pixel datum

encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

3.6   **As per claim 11, Mast** discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see

column 9, lines 8-20).

3.7   **As per claim 14, Mast** substantially teaches the limitations of claim 14 using a method

and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 14** recites the same

limitation as the rejected claim 1 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system. A

computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage, a digital filter to identify and modify

pixel data, and processors to replace or copy information to memory. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

3.8   As per claim 17, **Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claim 17** is similar to the rejected **claim 4**. Therefore, **claim 17** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 4**.

3.9   As per claim 19, **Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claim 19** recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are distinct data busses. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system has distinct data buses to transfer data for storage (see column 4, lines 19-28).

3.10   As per claim 20, **Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claim 20** recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are the same data bus. The fact of using the same data bus instead of two distinct data buses may reduce cost. However, having one bus may slow down the process of transmitting data, and furthermore, it does not provide any backup if the bus fails. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable of using either the same bus or distinct data buses (see column 4, lines 19-28).

3.11   **Claims 21, 41, and 75** are similar to the rejected **claim 8** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 21, 41, and 75** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 8**.

3.12   **As per claims 23-26, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claims 23-26** are

similar to the rejected **claims 10-13** respectively. Therefore, **claims 23-26** are rejected on the

same rationale as the rejection of **claims 10-13**.

As per claim 27, Mast substantially teaches a method for protecting digital images

copied from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-62). **Mast**

discloses the step of transmitting stored pixel data from a computer memory to a video RAM

(column 3, lines 25-57). As defined in the dictionary, the pixels are the basic units of the

composition of the image disclosed by **Mast**. **Mast** also discloses the step of identifying

protected image within the image in memory that meets the recitation of identifying the protected

pixel data within the stored pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, lines 57-61).

Mast further discloses the steps of modifying the stored pixel data, thereby generating modified

pixel data within which individual pixel datum is recognizable as being protected or unprotected

(column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1).

3.13   **As per claim 36, Mast** substantially teaches the limitations of claim 36 using a method

and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 36** recites the same

limitation as the rejected claim 1 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system. A

computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage and a digital filter to identify and

modify pixel data. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can

be applied in a system.

Claims 39 and 69 are similar to the rejected claim 4 except for incorporating the claimed

method into a system. Therefore, claims 39 and 69 are rejected on the same rationale as the

rejection of claim 4.

3.14   Claims 43 and 79 are similar to the rejected claim 12 except for incorporating the

claimed method into a system. Therefore, claims 43 and 79 are rejected on the same rationale as

the rejection of claim 12.

3.15   Claims 44 and 80 are similar to the rejected claim 13 except for incorporating the

claimed method into a system. Therefore, claims 44 and 80 are rejected on the same rationale as

the rejection of claim 13.

3.16   As per claim 45, Mast substantially teaches a method for protecting pixel data captured

from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-62). As defined in the

dictionary, the pixels are the basic units of the composition of the image disclosed by Mast.

Mast also discloses the step of identifying protected pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and

column 10, lines 57-61). Mast further discloses the pixel data being such that individual pixel

datum is recognizable as being protected or unprotected (column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10,

line 53 through column 11, line 1); and in response to pixel data being copied from the video

RAM, replacing individual pixel datum copied from the video RAM, that is protected, with

substitute pixel datum (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1).

As per claim 46, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by a screen capture command (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim 47, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by command to copy screen data to a clipboard (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim 48, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47). Mast further discloses that the image files are protected from misappropriation with some form of encryption and suggests to use other encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7, lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme, to have the substitute pixel datum encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

As per claim 49, Mast discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

3.17   As per claim 50, Mast substantially teaches the limitations of claim 50 using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). Claim 50 recites the same

limitation as the rejected claim 45 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system

comprising a data bus and a pixel processor. A computer system has data buses to transfer data

for storage, and processors to replace individual pixel datum. It is apparent to one skilled in the

art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

Claim 51 is similar to the rejected **claim 10** except for incorporating the claimed method

into a system. Therefore, **claim 51** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 10**.

Claim 52 is similar to the rejected **claim 11** except for incorporating the claimed method

into a system. Therefore, **claim 51** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 11**.

3.18   **As per claim 53, Mast** substantially teaches a method for protecting digital images

copied from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-62). **Mast**

discloses the steps of modifying the stored pixel data so as to mark it as being protected (column

3, lines 30-49 and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1). As defined in the dictionary,

the pixels are the basic units of the composition of the image disclosed by **Mast**. **Mast** further

discloses the step of transmitting stored pixel data including the modified protecting pixel data

from a computer memory to a video RAM (column 3, lines 25-57 and column 9, line 48 through

column 10).   **Mast** also discloses the step of identifying protected image within the image in

memory that meets the recitation of identifying the protected pixel data within the stored pixel

data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, lines 57-61); and in response to pixel data being

copied from the video RAM, replacing individual pixel datum copied from the video RAM, that

is protected, with substitute pixel datum (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1).

3.19   **Claims 58-59** are similar to the rejected **claims 6-7** respectively. Therefore, **claims 58-59** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claims 6-7**.

3.20   **Claims 62-63** are similar to the rejected **claims 10-11** respectively. Therefore, **claims 62-63** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claims 10-11**.

3.21   **As per claim 64, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the protected pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47).

3.22   **As per claim 65, Mast** discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted stored pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

3.23   **As per claim 66, Mast** substantially teaches the limitations of **claim 66** using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 66** recites the same limitation as the rejected claim 53 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system comprising a data bus and a pixel processor. A computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage, and processors to modify and replace pixel data. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

3.24   **As per claim 71, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 66. **Claim 71** recites the

limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are distinct data busses. It is

apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system has distinct data buses to transfer data

for storage (see column 4, lines 19-28).

3.25   **As per claim 72, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 66. **Claim 72** recites the

limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are the same data bus. The fact

of using the same data bus instead of two distinct data buses may reduce cost. However, having

one bus may slow down the process of transmitting data and furthermore it does not provide any

backup if the bus fails. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable

of using either the same bus or distinct data buses (see column 4, lines 19-28).

3.26   **As per claim 73, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 66. **Claim 73** recites the

limitation of wherein said first pixel processor and said second pixel processor are distinct

processors. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system may have distinct

processors for different tasks (see also column 4, lines 19-28).

3.27   **As per claim 74, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 66. **Claim 74** recites the

limitation of wherein said first pixel processor and said second pixel processor are the same

processors. The fact of using the same processor instead of two distinct processors may reduce

cost. It is apparent to one skilled in the art to have a system using a CPU as a processor to

perform all the tasks. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable of

using either the same processor or distinct processors (see also column 4, lines 19-28).

3.5   **As per claim 77, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 66 and further discloses the

limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47).

Mast further discloses that the image files are protected from misappropriation with some form

of encryption and suggests to use other encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7,

lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme,

to have the substitute pixel datum encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

3.6   **As per claim 78, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 66 and further discloses the

limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or

described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter

sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have

been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to

which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which

the invention was made.

Claims 2-3, 5, 15-16, 18, 28-29, 31, 37-38, 40, 54-55, 57, 67-68, and 70 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,881,287 to **Mast** in view of US

Patent 6,088,355 to **Mills et al.**.

4.1   **As per claims 2 and 28, Mast** discloses modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or

distorted in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected images (column 9,

lines 59-67). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying the least significant bits of pixel data. To

a person having ordinary skill in copyright protection of digital data, modifying means changing

any of the bits therein, as to the least significant or the most significant pixel data as well as any

of the color components. **Mills et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant

bit of each of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel

(column 13, line 59 through column 14, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the stored pixel of **Mast** to

set the least significant bits of pixel data as **Mills et al.** teaches. This modification would have

been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions

provided by **Mills et al.** so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

4.2   **As per claims 3 and 29, Mast** discloses modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or

distorted in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected images (column 9,

lines 59-67). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying the least significant bits of the blue color

components. **Mills et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of each

of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel (column 13,

line 59 through column 14, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Mast** to set the least

significant bits of the blue color components. This modification would have been obvious

because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Mills et**

al. so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

4.3   **As per claim 5, Mast** substantially teaches the claimed method of claim 4. **Mast**

discloses modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or distorted in some way to indicate that

those regions correspond to protected images (column 9, lines 59-67). **Mills et al.** in an

analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of each of the R, G, and B color values

to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel (column 13, line 59 through column 14, line

9). As per the limitation of **claim 5,** since the term "substantially similar" is indefinite, examiner

interprets that the modified pixel data when modifying the least significant bit as disclosed by

Mills et al. will appear substantially similar to the stored pixel data. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

method of **Mast** to set the least significant bits of the blue color components. This modification

would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the

suggestions provided by **Mills et al.** so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

4.4   **Claims 15, 37, and 67** are similar to the rejected **claim 2** except for incorporating the

claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 15, 37, and 67** are rejected on the same

rationale as the rejection of **claim 2.**

4.5   **Claims 16, 38, and 68** are similar to the rejected **claim 3** except for incorporating the

claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 16, 38, and 68** are rejected on the same

rationale as the rejection of **claim 3**.

4.6   **Claims 18, 40, and 70** are similar to the rejected **claim 5** except for incorporating the

claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 18, 40, and 70** are rejected on the same

rationale as the rejection of **claim 5**.

4.7   **Claims 31 and 57** are similar to the rejected **claim 5**. Therefore, **claims 31 and 57** are

rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 5**.

4.8   **As per claim 54, Mast** discloses a method of marking by modifying the stored pixels

with any pattern or distorted in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected

images (column 9, lines 59-67). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying the least significant

bits of pixel data. **Mills et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of

each of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel

(column 13, line 59 through column 14, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of marking of

Mast based on values of the least significant bits of pixel data. This modification would have

been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions

provided by **Mills et al.** so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

4.9   As per claim 55, Mast discloses modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or distorted

in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected images (column 9, lines 59-

67). Mast does not explicitly teach modifying the least significant bits of the blue color

components. Mills et al. in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of each

of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel (column 13,

line 59 through column 14, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of marking protected

pixels of Mast to set the least significant bits of the blue color components as suggested by Mills

et al.. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have

been motivated by the suggestions provided by Mills et al. so as to indicate that the pixel data

are protected.

5.   Claims 9, 22, 33, 42, 61, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent 5,881,287 to Mast in view of US Patent 6,463,467 to Mages et al..

5.1   As per claim 9, Mast substantially teaches the claimed method of claim 8. Mast does

not explicitly disclose downloading the at least one protected image over the Internet. Mages et

al. in an analogous art teaches downloading the protected images over the Internet (see columns

3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the method of Mast to include the step of downloading the

protected images over the Internet. This modification would have been obvious because one

skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Mages et al.** for

easy access and to choose from a variety of protected images.

5.2   **Claims 22, 42, and 76** are similar to the rejected **claim 9** except for incorporating the

claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 22, 42, and 76** are rejected on the same

rationale as the rejection of **claim 9**.

5.3   **Claims 33 and 61** are similar to the rejected **claim 9**. Therefore, **claims 33 and 61** are

rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 9**.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

a. US Patent   5,745,254   Satou

This patent pertains to an image reading device for obtaining good images at constant

speed.

b. US Patent   5,012,232   Fadem

This patent pertains to a video display controller for controlling the display of characters

stored in a bit plane memory.

c. US Patent   5,642,207   Smitt

This patent pertains to an optical scanner with variable line resolution to collect

information from an original along lines with a predetermined mutual spacing.

6.1.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 703-305-0355. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and every other Friday, 8:30-

6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 703-305-9595. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular

communications and 703-746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Guy J. Lamarre
for
Albert DeCady
Primary Examiner

cc

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

September 17, 2003